



2.

H Grant provided an update on progress against tackling anti-social behaviour in GGHT estates.

HG provided an overview of performance against ASB response times from March 2011 – February 2012. The following points were highlighted:

- ❖ Responses to emergency ASB cases have shown a positive trend from 98% in Quarter 1 to 100% in Quarter 3. Quarter 2 fell below target due to staffing issues and a seasonal increase in ASB reports.
- ❖ The Neighbourhoods Team has reduced its response time for non-emergency cases from 10 days to 5 days. Work is ongoing to move towards a response time of 24 hours for non-emergency cases
- ❖ A risk assessment has been introduced which means that all customers reporting a new case of anti-social behaviour will be telephoned within 24 hours. This will allow us to identify any risk to the individual, and to undertake safety planning with the customer.
- ❖ GGHT has been set up as a Community Reporting Centre for hate crime

HG advised that noises and verbal abuse are the most common form of anti-social behaviour case - a trend that is reflected nationally.

RP asked whether the noise complaints related to both internal and external incidences. Would sound proofing walls and ceilings help resolve the issue? HG advised that the complaints could be related to either external or internal incidences. Sound proofing has been installed in some flats but has not always been effective in reducing the level of noise. HG advised that the team have recently worked with acoustic specialists who have advised that noise can travel differently in different types of property, for example it may be more of an issue in converted flats as opposed to purpose built flats.

JS asked why there had been a significant increase in garden complaints. HG advised that garden complaints are more commonly reported due to an increase in estate inspections and the introduction of an Untidy Garden Policy. The costs of garden tools are often too expensive and this can make it difficult for tenants to maintain their gardens.

LJ asked for the percentage of noise complaints that were animal or pet-related. HG advised that animal or pet related noise complaints will be included within the 'Noise' or 'Pet or Animal Nuisance' categories set by the Government in 2003. The Government conducted a "One Day Count of ASB" in 2003 as part of the development of the Respect Standard. The review looked at the main categories of ASB and Housing Providers who have signed to the standard have adopted these categories so that they can benchmark their performance against other Registered Providers of Social Housing.

LJ asked how many noise complaints have been reported within Warrington from the Period March 2011 to February 2012. HG advised that there have been 422 noise complaints within Warrington.

LJ asked whether the data provided in the pie chart reflected national cases of

ASB. HG advised that the categories listed were set by the Government but the data reflected local trends.

PT asked whether 1142 complaints meant that GGHT deal with 3 complaints a day on average. HG advised that number of complaints per day could increase to 7-8 a day during the Summer months. In some cases tenants contact GGHT to report a problem that should be dealt with by the emergency services. GGHT needs to ensure tenants understand which issues can be resolved by their landlord.

MR asked if there are any specific areas where levels of ASB were particularly high. HG advised that the majority of GGHT properties are located in central areas where levels of ASB are expected to be higher. Longford, Bewsey and Dallam all have higher levels of ASB than outlying areas.

HG advised that tenants who witness ASB are able to submit anonymous information to the Police. Crimestoppers have developed a scheme to incentivise tenants to submit anonymous information. If the information provided leads to a successful prosecution then the tenant will be given a code which can be taken to the bank and used to withdraw cash as a financial reward.

JS asked whether GGHT had experience problems linked to prostitution. HG advised that GGHT has not received a high volume of complaints linked to this issue or any sex related ASB. However GGHT has close links with the police and their public protection unit and receives regular updates at various multi-agency meetings, which may include the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC), Neighbourhood Action Team Meetings (NAT)

JS asked why performance for non-emergency response times in Quarter 2 was highlighted in red font. HG advised that this highlighted that performance for this period fell below target of 90%.

HG advised that GGHT has 10 surveillance systems which include infrared covert cameras and standard overt cameras. Tapes or video files are usually kept until a court case is complete or for a maximum of 3 years.

DT asked whether the new equipment has had a positive impact on tackling ASB. HG advised that the new equipment provides assurance to GGHT tenants and acts as a deterrent against ASB perpetrators.

HG advised that GGHT aims to publish the names and faces of individuals that have committed ASB. CCP have agreed that this will help promote awareness to residents and encourage tenants to report ASB. GGHT had developed a system of safeguards to ensure legalities were met. For example, GGHT could not name offenders whilst a trial was pending.

HG advised that, for complex cases, it could cost GGHT up to £5,000 to serve an injunction. HG advised that ASBOs (for under 18s) and injunctions are a

	<p>cheaper alternatives to evictions and place a greater focus on changing the behaviour of ASB offenders.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether GGHT was required to cover the costs of injunctions. HG advised that it would be unusual for the courts to request payment from tenants and that perpetrators are unlikely to be able to meet the costs of the injunctions and so court costs can be difficult to recover.</p> <p>DT asked whether GGHT could serve injunctions against tenants that smoked cannabis in their properties. HG advised that the courts will not always accept an application for an injunction against drug users as opposed to drug dealers. However, GGHT is able to request a possession order (which can be suspended on terms) or demotion of tenancies if there is sufficient evidence of drug related anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>HG advised that a case is currently ongoing with Plus Dane Group that could impact on the ability of social landlords to enforce 1 year trial tenancies. The outcome of this trial will be announced in June.</p> <p>HG advised that GGHT is working with Civica rolling out a new I.T. system this year to manage anti-social behaviour. When fully implemented, the system will calculate the costs and time to assess whether the service is providing value for money.</p> <p>HG advised that a laptop has been issued to staff the ASB Team to take on site visits to enable mobile working. The use of laptops will reduce the amount of repeat visits, for example when needing to take statements from witnesses. DT asked if GGHT used Dictaphones to take statements from tenants. HG advised that Dictaphones were only used when taking statements that needed to be translated into English.</p> <p>DT asked whether the issue concerning the vicious Dog at Bexhill Avenue has been resolved. HG advised that the case was still ongoing and GGHT has made a claim for possession in the County Court.</p> <p>MR asked HG what she felt was the most significant issue within ASB. HG advised that there was always a high volume of ASB complaints and resolving these could be very challenging. However, HG advised that it is a challenge that she relishes.</p> <p>The Panel thanked HG for her report.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Right First Time</b></p> <p>MB provided an overview of performance against Right First Time for the period April 2011 to March 2012. The Right First Time indicator monitors the percentage of repairs which are completed Right First Time. This is defined as the total number of responsive repairs being completed right first time divided by the total number of responsive repairs being completed multiplied by 100.</p>	

GGHT are registered with Housemark – an online benchmarking tool that enables GGHT to compare its own performance against that of other housing providers. However, GGHT does not benchmark its performance for Right First Time against other Housing Associations as this indicator is not a business target.

MB explained that GGHT needs to decide whether Right First Time is a benchmarked indicator it wants to participate in. If so GGHT will need to look at developing a mechanism for capturing the information in line with the definition.

JS asked why performance had dropped to 77% in February 2012. MB explained that GGHT had experienced technical issues with Contact Manager and scheduling systems during this period and all processes had to be implemented manually.

CP advised that GGHT will continue to monitor and respond to negative feedback from customers. GGHT needs to understand the reasons for complaints in order to improve the service provided to tenants.

MB advised that new systems have been rolled out that enable GGHT to listen to calls between contact centre staff and customers to ensure that repairs have been logged correctly. Further work is needed to improve the diagnostic tool and develop a list of specific questions that will GGD staff will be able to ask customers before logging a repair. Training for GGD staff will also be considered a priority. A working group has been set-up and GGHT operatives will be consulted throughout the process.

RP advised that GGD staff might not have enough experience as to how repairs are carried out. CP advised that the new processes will ensure GGD staff have a greater understanding through the use of the diagnostic tool about the nature of the repair that has been reported, by fine tuning the prompted questions we can ensure the right skilled operative with the right materials are sent to complete the job.

MB advised that GGHT have regular meetings with Jewsons to ensure GGHT operatives will have the correct materials and supplies. MB advised that GGHT vans can transport up to 2,500 kilos, any more than this would result in increased fuel costs so having the right imprest van stock is important.

AF asked what processes other housing organisations had in place to capture Right First Time. CP advised that Helena Housing had a designated Officer responsible for collecting Right First Time data. Helena captured the data on the same day that the repair has been raised and completed and it is fair to say that this is not in line with the housemark definition but may be the agreed way forward with customers.

RP asked whether GGHT used contractors for repairs. CP advised that approx. 95% of repairs are completed in-house. Contractors are used for repairs where there is a specialism required such as the removal of asbestos

**AF**

and damp proofing. RP raised a query concerning sub-contractors and it was agreed that this should be picked up at the Complaints Panel on Thursday 10 May.

MB advised that it is unlikely that GGHT and all other RPs would achieve 100% Right First Time given the nature of temporary repairs and the availability of supplies. For example, a broken window would be boarded up until new supplies were ordered and a new window fitted. DT asked that, given these complications, should GGHT continue to monitor Right First Time. MB advised that the indicator set a target that GGHT should aspire to achieve. However, removing temporary repairs from the definition would provide a more realistic target.

MB advised that a paper will be taken to CCP to consult customers on what they feel should be included within the Right First Time indicator. MB advised that work is ongoing to train the 70 new starters that have joined the Property Services Team.

CP advised that operatives who are unable to complete a repair will be encouraged to contact their assistant manager for additional support or parts and advice. It is important that operatives understand how long the repair will take and to let the assistant manager know if they do not have enough time to complete the repair. CP advised that the scheduler system will alert the contact centre if an operative has been at a property for a longer period of time than is required to complete the repair reported. If GGHT is unable to contact the Operative than another team member can be asked to visit the property and offer support, the tracking system is utilised for this purpose and reference was made for protection (i.e. lone working).

RP asked whether the repairs could be handed over to the out of hours team. CP advised that this would be too costly and that it would be better Value For Money for the operatives to stay longer to fix the problem within their contracted hours.

RP asked whether trackers have been installed to all GGHT's vans. MB advised that GGHT currently has 85 vans in its fleet and each van has had a tracker installed.

PT asked whether operatives had phones. MB advised that all operatives had phones. The scheduling team members keep in touch with the operatives during the course of the day by telephone. Reference was made to whether the same GGD operatives handle the repair calls and complaints and customer queries.

LJ asked when the new diagnostic system will be rolled out. MB advised that this is an ongoing development and that work is ongoing with I.T. to ensure the required systems can be put in place.

RP asked for an update on the installation of PV panels. MB advised that the installation of PV panels on GGHT properties is still ongoing. GGHT is

	currently awaiting details of the Government's Affordable Warmth Scheme which could offer opportunities for additional funding.	
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Annual Report 2011-12 (Verbal Update)</b></p> <p>AF advised that the Annual Report 2011-12 will be drafted in consultation with the Communication and Scrutiny Panel. As part of the revised social housing regulatory framework and the requirement to ensure that customers are involved in the scrutiny of the organisation's performance the annual report will also include an update on the work of the Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>AF advised that the report has been taken to the Communications Panel. The panel have suggested that the following areas be included within the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Investment Programme</li> <li>❖ Handy Person service</li> <li>❖ Update on PV Solar Panel installation</li> <li>❖ Rent section</li> <li>❖ Information on bungalows</li> <li>❖ Update on area blitz in relation to welfare reform</li> <li>❖ Jobs created through apprenticeships</li> <li>❖ Information on tackling loan shares</li> <li>❖ Photos for Board Members</li> <li>❖ Information on co-regulatory framework and role of Scrutiny Panel</li> </ul> <p>DT asked who has the print tender for this year's annual report. AF advised that the final version will be sent to CBS to print in October.</p> <p>DT asked for the estimated costs for printing and postage. AF advised that last year's report cost £1,700 due to design costs. This year's report will be designed in-house to reduce the overall costs.</p> <p>LJ asked when the Panel needed to draft its section for the Annual Report. AF advised that the panel update will need to be completed by July and advised that extra meetings can be held to facilitate this.</p>	<b>AF/CM</b>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>A.O.B</b></p> <p>The Panel agreed that Linda Levin should be invited to attend the next meeting on 13 June.</p> <p>A copy of the Estate Inspection feedback sheet was circulated to the Panel. DT asked the panel for their views on the issues that had been picked up during the inspection. The Panel agreed that it would like to be kept updated on progress against the issues raised.</p> <p>CM advised that Fiona Graham will present Outturn performance at the next meeting.</p> <p>CM had received a response from HHT in relation to meeting the Trust's Scrutiny Panel. The Panel agreed that they would like to visit HHT and asked</p>	<b>CM</b>     <b>CM</b>

	<p>CM to arrange.</p> <p>JS advised that she not received an invite to the Communications Panel. CM agreed to look into this.</p>	<b>CM</b>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Meeting Evaluation</b></p> <p>The panel agreed it had been a productive meeting and advised that it was important that report authors attended meetings. The Panel felt that Officer attendance demonstrated that staff respected the Panel and its role within the organisation.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Date &amp; Time of Next Meeting : 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012, 10am, Warrington Disability Partnerships</b></p>	